
T H E

C R I S I S.

N U M B E R XLII. *To be continued Weekly.*

SATURDAY, November 4, 1775. [Price Two Pence Half-penny.]

* * The Authors of the CRISIS propose, in their next Number, to DISSECT the last BLOODY Speech of the present Pious, Hypocritical Sovereign; the Operation would have been performed this Week, but the CALM ADDRESS of the canting, jesuitical *Wesley*, agreeable to the order of Time, claimed our Attention first.

Whilst servile *Wesley's* Pen with *Johnson's* vyes,
Enforcing all his Sophistry and Lyes;
Enlisted in the Service of the *Press*,
His *passive* Soul breaths forth a *Calm Address*.
This *Saint* from holy Toils how *Mammon* draws!
Truth his pretence, but *Gain* the latent Cause.
A *Mitre* tempts; and *North*, not slow to thank,
Returns the *Priest* his Compliments in *Bank*.
North knows *Saints* fight, but never think, nor yield;
And thus secures the Myriads of *Moorfield*.
Mad Hosts, who drown with Hymns the Trumpet's Sound,
And purchase Heav'n by dunging hostile Ground!

ANONYM.



HE trumpet sounds in *Zion*; the sons of *Whitfield* are alarmed, and *John Wesley* himself hath taken up the arms of the spirit.---How wretched a cause have *Bute* and *Mansfield*, when the very *Tabernacles* must be ransacked for advocates, and field-preachers are enlisted in the service of a ministerial *press*? *General Gage* complains (I think in his proclamation for enforcing military law in *America*) that the *presses* there teemed with sedition, and that the very *pulpits* were prostituted to that service. Is not every imposition, every means of blinding and deceiving the good People of *England* practised in our metropolis both by clergy and laity, in the pulpits, in the public papers, in lying pamphlets, in public Coffee Houses, nay, in private families, as often as ministerial hirelings can gain admittance? Do not the corrupt lackeys of a corrupt *Administration*, insinuate themselves, like evil Genii, into every company, in all shapes and characters, labouring to taint the principles of every honest *Revolutionist*? Are not

not the pastors of every *sect* pressed into the trammels of government, to aid, defend, or palliate the pernicious schemes of *Bute* and *Mansfield*, those *Empsons* and *Dudleys* of this Nation? The very enthusiasts of *Moorfields*, are now wrapt in political reveries, their Tabernacles resound with *anti-revolution Doctrines*, whilst their holy pastors are drawn aside by the *Mammon* of unrighteousness. Paradvventure, a pair of *lawn sleeves* is promised (and only promised) to *John Wesley*, if he will work up his *thousands and ten thousands*, to roar, like bulls of *Basan*, in the cause of *falsehood, corruption, tyranny, and blood*.

By the acquisition of this leader of the *clerk*, how are the secular arms of *Johnson* and his scribbling *Garretts* strengthened and enforced? How is the ministerial cause supported? With what awful pomp will the royal standard be hoisted, when these maddening zealots, with *John Wesley* at their head, shall dance before it, and all the furious hosts of *hot-heads* shall shout *Amen*, to the bloody Purposes of a pusillanimous driveling King, cloathed in *purple and fine linen*!-----However this new captain of our *political salvation* may have escaped unanswered from his *Tabernacles*, he must, in this worldly warfare of the *press*, submit, not only to a reply, but, perhaps, to some rebuke. When he takes up the pen, he must remember that he wields a weapon of the *flesh*, and must sometimes stoop to kiss the rod.-----In his late *Calm Address* to our *American Colonies*, I find but little to applaud, though much to reprehend. This preacher treads in *Johnson's* steps; but without the least abilities or knowledge, as a *hackney writer*. He is a mimic of his master; he apes his *sophistry*, and almost equals his *audacity*. He sets out by likening a body of *Colonists*, settling under the royal charter, to a trading corporation, or the vestry of a parish. Proceeding upon this infectious mistake (among others which he has copied from his master *Johnson*) all he advances must be wrong. He will pardon me if I submit to him my notion of a *chartered Colony*, by observing, that emigrants from civilised states, who have the settlement of a colony in view, though they leave their native country, do not mean to abandon their natural allegiance. They change their place without a change either of their national or social principles and attachments. In consequence of these sentiments and affections, the first act of notoriety where they fix their settlement, is generally to hoist the colours of that state from whence they come, claiming, by proclamation, the vacant territory for their lawful sovereign, whose charter they receive, of course, as an assurance of his protection, in return to their loyal declaration of allegiance. Thus foreign territories, discovered by Englishmen, (and the same rule holds among all civilized nations) belong to the crown of England. I say, to the crown of England, to the sovereign only, and not to king, lords, and commons. It is the undoubted prerogative of the sovereign to grant a charter, which may, if the king thinks fit, be a charter of incorporation to his colony. By the word colony I understand a body of emigrants who separate from one community to form another distinct one where they please, still professing allegiance to, and, in return, receiving protection from, their natural or lawful sovereign, by virtue of his royal charter. Now where is the least similitude between such an emigrant body, though incorporated (as some have actually been) for the purpose of settling a colony, and a trading corporation; except that both have received the royal charter? At the same time, it must be observed, that it is not in the king's power, whatever he may intend, to abridge the rights and liberties of his subjects by any restrictions in such charter. Though the chartered body thereby acquires a new politic capacity, yet it still retains, in all its individual members, its natural capacity. A mere fiction of law cannot extinguish the rights of a subject. To such a fiction every corporate body owes its politic existence. Taken collectively it is the creature of the king, and its rights are circumscribed (as the ministerial scribblers insist) by charter; but taken individually, they are so many members, or (permit me to say) *heirs*, of the British constitution, whose rights were clearly settled at the revolution, as far as that settlement extends; for it is not perfect; it is confessed on all hands.

(not inimical to the constitution) that some necessary stipulations are omitted. Be that as it may, the rights of all *corporate* bodies, acting in their *natural* capacities, can be limited only (as the constitution stands at present) by the compact between sovereign and subject at the *revolution*. We do not find *there*, that subjects can be *taxed* without their *consent*, as parson *Wesley* asserts. We do not find there that the *king* can annex his *colony* (his own *demesnes*) to the realm of England by other means than the policy of the English law allows, that is, by act of parliament; for to such acts as concern the whole realm, the whole realm, all its *three* estates, king, lords, and commons, must be parties. By these, and these means only, can a colony, *out of the realm*, be *taxed* constitutionally by our parliament. The colony cannot otherwise be either *virtually*, or *actually* represented; and therefore all the flimsy *Tory* arguments respecting *virtual* representation must fall to the ground; and the mercenary troops of ministerial *pen-men* are laid on their backs, as it is devoutly wished their *swordsmen* may be on the plains of distressed, insulted, and dragooned *America*.

If the pockets of *America*, like those of *Great Britain*, must be picked, for the worst of purposes, that of undermining the constitution, let them be picked *in due form*, and with some shew and colour of decency; let them be picked according to the established precedent for annexing the sole property of the crown, in *foreign territories*, to the realm of England: they will still be picked no less by *act of parliament*, without letting loose *famine*, *fire*, *massacre*, and all the miseries of war upon subjects whom neither *king* nor *parliament* have a right to *pillage*, but in a *legal way*.---Let me pursue this disquisition a little further. In that community which English colonists have left, they were either *actually* or *virtually* represented, or they could not have been bound by any law of the legislature which they left behind them. In the new community, also, of which they are now become a part, they must be represented likewise, either *actually* or *virtually*, before they can be bound. But in the legislature of that community which they have left they cannot be bound (in respect to pecuniary taxation) because they are now no longer, either *actually* or *virtually* represented there. How can the commons of *England* give and grant the money of a distinct community of another realm or territory, not yet annexed to the realm of *England*? In a territory which is the *sovereign's demesne*; for whatever some hireling scribblers have asserted to the contrary, yet all territories newly discovered still belong (as they did at the time the several settlements were made and granted on the *American* continent) to the crown. They who deny this know, or ought to know, that in order to avoid an unanswerable difficulty, they have the impudence to deny an undoubted truth.

As the king's prerogative stands at present (for it still stands as it did in the reigns of our worst kings, the *Stuarts*) all new colonies must hold their lands (as the old ones originally did) of the king, as tenants in *capite*. It is, indeed, in the sovereign's power, if he pleases, to grant these *demesnes* of his in *capite*, to be held of him for the future as *free socage*; in such case the kings of England have ever received some valuable consideration for such grant. King Charles the second received a subsidy of four and a half per cent. on the sugars of that island from the colonists of Barbados, on this consideration. There are other instances of this in the other Carribbee islands. Now who were the parties to this grant? The parliament of England did not, nor could, interfere with the least propriety (though jealous of prerogative at that time a-day) in a matter which concerned the king and his property alone. Who granted this revenue to the king, this *internal tax* (for so it was) the parliament of *England*, or the legislature of Barbados? It was the latter, who thought then, as *America* thinks now, (and rightly thinks) that they had an exclusive and peculiar right to give and grant the monies which they earned by the sweat of their own brows in a community distinct from that of *England*. This tax was, in the strictest sense, *internal*; for it was to be paid before
their

their own sugars could be permitted to be shipped from their island to their mother country. Though king Charles the second (who by turns duped, and was again himself the dupe of parliament) in his charters to Connecticut and Rhode Island, and Pennsylvania; though *William and Mary* in their grant of Maryland to Lord Baltimore, expressly reserve to the parliament of England (merely out of complaisance) their full power of taxation, &c. over those colonies, yet that reservation can confer no new powers on the parliament, much less can it enable them to tax unconstitutionally, and without either actual or virtual representation, persons who had quitted their territory for a distinct community, and who had acquired in that new community a new property of their own, of which they cannot legally be stripped but in due and legal form, either by the law of nature, the law of nations, or the common law of England, which every emigrant to an English colony takes with him, though he leaves his former legislature together with the local privileges and benefits of England behind him.

Now, tell me, thou *calm addresser*, thou echo of thy master *Johnson*, in what respect is such a chartered body of emigrants like a trading corporation, or like the *vestry of a parish*, neither of which bodies are (like foreign colonies) out of the Realm, or unrepresented either actually or virtually in our parliament? No argument can be fairly formed, no just and true conclusions can be drawn between cases which are totally dissimilar. Though this corporation of colonists may subsist (as Mr. *Wesley* says) by a grant from *higher authority*, yet that *high authority* to which, he says, they still continue subject, cannot tax, (and most of our royal charters declare that the King will not tax them himself) nor can the King give the parliament of England a power of taxing them, and therefore the reservations of such a power in the royal charters to our parliament, is vain and nugatory, mere courtly froth, as I said before.

Having thus, with more attention than Mr. *Wesley's* whole performance deserves, overturned his corner stone, I leave all his first eight plain inferences, as so many baseless superstructures, to fall to the ground. Whatever his designs may be, he is no less a *visionary* in politics than in religion. His first eight paragraphs are a mere abridgment of the futile arguments which have been retailed by all the ministerial scribblers, from their Captain, Doctor *Johnson*, down to himself, and have been confuted again and again.

I come now to his ninth paragraph, where he declares his opinion freely, upon his own *virre dire*, assuring his readers that he is quite unbiassed, and that he has nothing to hope or fear on either side. I congratulate him upon this christian spirit of self-denial, so highly becoming a man of his sacred function; should he hope for a *bishoprick*, or even for a *deanery*, he must know that no confidence can be put in princes, nor in the sons of men, for they will deceive him; should he fear that his numerous flocks (from whence alone, perhaps, his hope cometh) should return to their sober senses, awakened, as from a dream, by the tyranny of their rulers; his fears are groundless; such holy poisons as priest-craft can instill prevent all recovery.---But let us hear him---He says, there are a few men who are declared enemies to *monarchy*---true---all *revolutionists* are enemies to every monarchy which is *unlimited*. Now, if the king lords and commons were to form a mere *cabal*, a *junto*, a *combination*, and *confederacy*; if the king had a venal majority of his own in the two houses, he would then be to all intents and purposes, a monarch *unlimited*.---Such a monarch, and such monarchy a *Briton* will always hate.---As to *personal hatred*, we see it sometimes even in the animal creation. Why does the generous horse hate the *ass*, as much as a wise man hates a *fool*?---As to the kingly office, it will ever be revered in England, while exercised upon *revolution principles*, and for ever opposed (perhaps to its destruction) when it proceeds upon principles of *usurpation*, *tyranny*, and *blood*. Every kingly act which exceeds the limits of *humanity* degrades the kingly office beneath the office of the

the common hangman.---As to a common-wealth, which Mr. Wesley dreams of, I believe it is no wise man's thought, much less his idol; yet Mr. Wesley seems as if he was deep in this secret---He has discovered these Guy Fawkes's with their dark lanthorns. This good man certainly pictures out (like his predecessor John Bunyan) what he has seen in some spiritual trance. Let him enjoy his vision, and penetrate, if he can, to the very bottom of a design which seems to be a secret to all beside himself.-----As to foreign assistance, England has good reason, of late, to be sick of it, and America can have no occasion to call it in; she is a nation of warriors, and is fully able (to the sorrow of our Machiavels) to effect her virtuous purposes by her own intrinsic strength.---Mr. Wesley's tenth paragraph contains the gentle, comfortable, sage, emollient admonitions of-----an old woman.---His eleventh paragraph is altogether *dehortatory*---it is a master-piece of rhetoric in that style. Dissuading America from a final breach and disunion with Great Britain, he apprizes her that the remedy will be worse than the disease; that is to say, that truly patriotic revolutionary resistance will, in its effects be more pernicious to brave and virtuous subjects than the worst of miseries which war can enforce, or tyrants can invent: for, O! says the preacher, what convulsions must poor America feel before any government is settled?---Poor America, Mr. Wesley? What, do you pity her? It is all over with you then; take my word for it, you will never be a bishop.---But, to be serious; why must America be so horribly convulsed before a government is settled there? What settled government upon earth ever proceeded upon sounder policy, greater deliberation, wisdom, fortitude, and good conduct, (I hope shortly to be able to add success) than the several American states. If to see a virtuous individual struggling with afflictions is a spectacle worthy of the Gods, as the divine Socrates declared, with what adoration would that greatest of all heathen philosophers have looked upon such a nation as America, united to a man in the noblest cause that ever justified resistance? What yoke can such a nation of heroes fear, but that which already galls them; that which they are wisely and bravely resolved to shake off, casting the cords of England from them? Should this resolve be crowned with the success it merits, our spiritual pastor's fears for the poor Americans will be eased.-----The man of God in his twelfth paragraph discovers, that his American brethren are dupes and tools to the designs of certain *Achitophels*, who are in league to overturn the English government in America. I suspect a most unpardonable erratum of the printer here. I am pretty confident (if Mr. Wesley is an honest man, for he does not want understanding) that instead of the words *English government*, we ought to read *English usurpation*. Let the true reading of this passage be restored, and these *Achitophels* will be *Abshaloms*; these designing incendiaries will become favours of the constitution.

I am now arrived at the spiritual exhortation to peace and *passive obedience*, with which this holy advocate for regal tyranny concludes his *Calm Address*. I shall dismiss it with this short observation: that if the City of London would but take their cue from this preacher-up of non-resistance, this divine joiner of borrowed arguments for slavery, their next address would be music to the sovereign. But, be the success of Mr. Wesley's little labours what they may, as he professes to write from the heart, a priest of such principles most certainly deserves a mitre.

I cannot, however, pass over his appendix to this *pastoral catch-penny*, wherein he passes many strictures upon Dr. Smith's sermon at Philadelphia. Mr. Wesley, like all other enthusiasts, is a very bold asserter, but a very weak opponent. What he endeavours to shew in his appendix is, that the American complaints of unconstitutional taxes, violated rights and infringed, or, as he calls them, *mutilated* charters, are vain and groundless. But hear, ye sheepish volunteers, for whom this preacher is beating up, how little this holy man knows of the English constitution; as it stands since the revolution. Dr. Smith has asserted, and most truly, that no power on earth has a right to give and grant away American property without American consent.---Then, says Mr. Wesley, you have no sovereign: because, every sovereign under heaven has a right to tax his subjects, that is, to grant their

their property either *with* or *without* their consent.---So peremptory, so audacious, so ensnaring an assertion should have dropped from him only in the *pulpit*, where he could neither have been confronted, contradicted, or exposed. This assertion, in a *general* sense, is false, in a *confined* one, as relative only to an *English* sovereign, not only false, but *treacherous*, nay *traiterous*. It is a capital treason against the sacred compact between king and people at the blessed *revolution*: it is poisoning the ductile minds of his implicit believers with that exploded doctrine which cost *Charles* the first his head,

Hail! *Wesley*, hail!--thy *Brass* the prize secures:
Ev'n *Johnson's* front's a bashful front to yours.

But this *ecclesiastic tool* does not blush even to repeat his monstrous assertion---"Am I, or two millions of Englishmen, made *slaves*," says he, "because we are taxed without our own consent?"---Tell me, then, thou shepherd of the *deaf*, thou inspired teacher of that faithful remnant which shall be saved, thou great surviving luminary of the *tabernacle*, if this is not *slavery*, what is the difference between *slavery* and *freedom*?----I pause for a reply,---Take your time for it, even till the last trump shall sound.----In the interim, let us hear this reverend deceiver again, this *unbiased* imposter, who has nothing to hope or fear from siding with an anti-revolution ministry, and thus basely offering up the grateful incense of a court sycophant to the weakest, if not the wickedest of men. This *divine* observes, that one of the *American* charters exempts the colony from the payment of taxes for *seven years*: this implies, says he, that taxes are to be paid after the expiration of that term; and remember, too, says he, that the *Pennsylvania* charter says, in express terms, that you are liable to taxation. These are the reasonings, observations, and opinions of all our Tyrants and their scribblers in respect to all the colonies, whether the royal charters speak or imply any thing upon this head or not. But neither the royal charters themselves, nor those sycophants who are paid for their mis-interpretation of them, can annul *right*, or sanctify and establish *wrong*. The nature of these two contrarieties will continue the same eternally, let a venal majority confound them as they will. It is well known, that no colony ever was taxed *internally*, but by their own assemblies, till the ingenious Mr. *Grenville* suggested that happy mode, which was soon dropped by our parliament in a *panic*, but afterwards resumed, and is now to be maintained and enforced by every pitiful ministerial stratagem at home, and by famine, sword, fire, and all the plagues calamities, and devastations of a most inhuman war abroad.---This righteous scribbler runs back, even to the early days of William the Conqueror, another confessed Tyrant, for arguments to support the despotic measures of a slavish, arbitrary majority of parliament, in the pious reign of *George* the third.----But to say the truth, our pamphleteer seems at all neither to understand himself, nor to convey his meaning clearly to the reader. I will, therefore, only remind him, that all earthly power, if communicated to a sovereign, must necessarily be communicated by the people, and by the people only, in whom alone it can reside.----Why should this *Calm Addresser* fly, in his concluding word from the exhortatory to the accusatory style? why should he leave his *American* sheep in a fume? why should he so uncharitably; and so groundlessly, condemn them as so many wicked confederates against their rightful *sovereign* and the *fundamental* laws of their country? Is every rightful sovereign so divine a being that he cannot commence a *tyrant*? And are the laws relating to *American* taxation, the *fundamental* laws of England? the truth is, that this clerical plagiarist, for his arguments are all pilfered, is either totally ignorant of the English constitution, or else he prostitutes a good understanding, and a sacred character, with selfish, or worse than selfish views, to serve the worst purposes of the worst administration that ever ruined a weak and deluded prince, or disgraced the annals of a free country.

C A S C A.

Printed and published for the Authors, by T. W. SHAW, in Fleet-street, opposite Anderton's Coffee House, where Letters to the Publisher will be thankfully received.